

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/824,527	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jehanne S. Sitton	1634	

All Participants:

 (1) Jehanne S. Sitton.

 (2) Rebecca McNeill.
Status of Application: Non-final rejection

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 April 2008
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

6-8, 13

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Jehanne S Sitton/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the method claims would be rejoined and suggested using the traditional Markush recitation "selected from the group consisting of" in claims 6, 7, 8. Additionally, the examiner indicated that a number of SEQ ID NOS were identical to each other. They are: 43 and 45; 46 and 34; 47 and 48; and 51-54. The examiner indicated that one of each of the duplicate SEQ ID NOS should be deleted from the claims. It was acknowledged that the duplication arose from the different strains which were isolated and sequenced and indicated in the sequence listing. However, the examiner pointed out that the SEQ ID NO was only a representation of a particular nucleotide sequence, not to other information in the sequence listing, and that deletion of duplicative SEQ ID NOS did not alter the scope of the claims. Applicant's attorney agreed to the changes in the attached Examiner's amendment.